



## MEETING OF THE

# PLANS & PROGRAMS TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

### Main Office

818 West Seventh Street  
12th Floor  
Los Angeles, California  
90017-3435

t (213) 236-1800  
f (213) 236-1825

[www.scag.ca.gov](http://www.scag.ca.gov)

**Officers:** President: Gary Ovitt, San Bernardino County • First Vice President: Richard Dixon, Lake Forest • Second Vice President: Harry Baldwin, San Gabriel • Immediate Past President: Yvonne B. Burke, Los Angeles County

**Imperial County:** Victor Carrillo, Imperial County • Jon Edney, El Centro

**Los Angeles County:** Yvonne B. Burke, Los Angeles County • Zev Yaroslavsky, Los Angeles County • Richard Alarcon, Los Angeles • Jim Aldinger, Manhattan Beach • Harry Baldwin, San Gabriel • Tony Cardenas, Los Angeles • Stan Carroll, La Habra Heights • Margaret Clark, Rosemead • Gene Daniels, Paramount • Judy Dunlap, Inglewood • Rae Gabelich, Long Beach • David Gafin, Downey • Eric Garcetti, Los Angeles • Wendy Greuel, Los Angeles • Frank Gurulé, Cudahy • Janice Hahn, Los Angeles • Isadore Hall, Compton • Keith W. Hanks, Azusa • José Huizar, Los Angeles • Jim Jeffra, Lancaster • Tom LaBonge, Los Angeles • Paula Lantz, Pomona • Barbara Messina, Alhambra • Larry Nelson, Artesia • Paul Nowatka, Torrance • Pam O'Connor, Santa Monica • Bernard Parks, Los Angeles • Jan Perry, Los Angeles • Ed Reyes, Los Angeles • Bill Rosendahl, Los Angeles • Greig Smith, Los Angeles • Tom Sykes, Walnut • Mike Ten, South Pasadena • Tonia Reyes Uranga, Long Beach • Antonio Villaraigosa, Los Angeles • Dennis Washburn, Calabasas • Jack Weiss, Los Angeles • Herb J. Wesson, Jr., Los Angeles • Dennis Zine, Los Angeles

**Orange County:** Chris Norby, Orange County • Christine Barnes, La Palma • John Beauman, Brea • Lou Bone, Tustin • Debbie Cook, Huntington Beach • Leslie Daigle, Newport Beach • Richard Dixon, Lake Forest • Troy Edgar, Los Alamitos • Paul Glaab, Laguna Niguel • Robert Hernandez, Anaheim • Sharon Quirk, Fullerton

**Riverside County:** Jeff Stone, Riverside County • Thomas Buckley, Lake Elsinore • Bonnie Flickinger, Moreno Valley • Ron Loveridge, Riverside • Greg Pettis, Cathedral City • Ron Roberts, Temecula

**San Bernardino County:** Gary Ovitt, San Bernardino County • Lawrence Dale, Barstow • Paul Eaton, Montclair • Lee Ann Garcia, Grand Terrace • Tim Jasper, Town of Apple Valley • Larry McCallion, Highland • Deborah Robertson, Rialto • Alan Wapner, Ontario

**Tribal Government Representative:** Andrew Masiel Sr., Pechanga Band of Luiseno Indians

**Ventura County:** Linda Parks, Ventura County • Glen Becerra, Simi Valley • Carl Morehouse, San Buenaventura • Toni Young, Port Hueneme

**Orange County Transportation Authority:** Art Brown, Buena Park

**Riverside County Transportation Commission:** Robin Lowe, Hemet

**Ventura County Transportation Commission:** Keith Millhouse, Moorpark

**Tuesday, July 31, 2007  
10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.**

**SCAG Offices  
818 West 7<sup>th</sup> Street, 12<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Bernardino Conference Room  
Los Angeles, CA 90017  
213.236.1800**

**Video Conference Location  
SCAG Inland Empire Office  
3600 Lime Street, Suite 216  
Riverside, CA 92501  
(951) 784-1513**

If members of the public wish to review the attachments or have any questions on any of the agenda items, please contact Pablo Gutierrez at 213.236.1929 or [gutierre@scag.ca.gov](mailto:gutierre@scag.ca.gov)

Agendas and Minutes for the P&P TAC are also available at:

<http://www.scag.ca.gov/rtptac/index.htm>

SCAG, in accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), will accommodate persons who require a modification of accommodation in order to participate in this meeting. If you require such assistance, please contact SCAG at (213) 236-1868 at least 72 hours in advance of the meeting to enable SCAG to make reasonable arrangements. To request documents related to this document in an alternative format, please contact (213) 236-1868.

# PLANS & PROGRAMS TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

## AGENDA

PAGE#

TIME

*"Any item listed on the agenda (action or information) may be acted upon at the discretion of the Committee".*

1.0 **CALL TO ORDER & INTRODUCTIONS** Ty Schuiling, Chair

2.0 **PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD**

Members of the public desiring to speak on an agenda item or items not on the agenda, but within the purview of the Committee, must fill out and present a speaker's card to the assistant prior to speaking. A speaker's card must be turned in before the meeting is called to order. Comments will be limited to three minutes. The chair may limit the total time for all comments to twenty (20) minutes.

3.0 **CONSENT CALENDAR**

3.1 Approval Items

3.1.1 Approve Minutes of June 21, 2007  
**Attached**

4.0 **DISCUSSION ITEMS**

4.1 Standing Items

- |       |   |   |         |
|-------|---|---|---------|
| 4.1.1 | <u>Growth Forecast: The SCAG<br/>Regional Economy: The Growth<br/>Forecast Story and Implications<br/>for Land Use &amp; Other Policies</u> | Steve Levy,<br>Director,<br>Center for the<br>Continuing Study of<br>California Economy | 25 min. |
| 4.1.2 | <u>Growth Forecast: RTP Growth<br/>Scenario Development and Model<br/>Analysis</u>  | Glen Bolen, FCA<br>Richard Kuzmyak  | 40 min. |
| 4.1.3 | <u>Highways and Arterials</u><br><i>No report</i>   |   |         |
| 4.1.4 | <u>Non-motorized / TDM</u><br><i>No report</i>  |   |         |

# PLANS & PROGRAMS TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

## AGENDA

---

- |   |   |                |
|---|---|----------------|
| 4.2 <u>2003 Base Year &amp; 2035 Baseline<br/>Modeling Result Comparison</u><br><i>Continued discussion of performance<br/>measures.</i>  | <b>Tarek Hatata,<br/>System Metrics</b> | <b>15 min.</b> |
| 4.3 <u>Proposed Goods Movement Control<br/>Measures</u><br><i>Continued discussion of AQMP measures.</i>  | <b>Tarek Hatata,<br/>System Metrics</b> | <b>15 min.</b> |
| 4.4 <u>Aviation/Ground Access Report</u><br><i>Results of the airport ground access analysis<br/>for the 2008 RTP including major<br/>recommended projects for each commercial<br/>airport.</i> | <b>Mike Armstrong,<br/>SCAG Staff</b>   | <b>15 min.</b> |

### **5.0 STAFF REPORT**

*No report*

### **6.0 ADJOURNMENT**

The next meeting date of the Plans & Programs Technical Advisory Committee will be decided at this meeting.

---

Plans & Programs Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)  
of the  
Southern California Association of Governments

June 21, 2007

***Minutes***

---

**THE FOLLOWING MINUTES ARE A SUMMARY OF THE PLANS & PROGRAMS TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC) MEETING. THE AUDIOCASSETTE TAPE OF THE ACTUAL MEETING IS AVAILABLE FOR LISTENING IN SCAG'S OFFICE.**

The P&P TAC held its meeting at the SCAG Headquarters in Los Angeles. The meeting was called to order by Miles Mitchell, Vice-Chair, LADOT.

**Members Present:**

Miles, Mitchell, Vice-Chair	LADOT
David Mootchnik	So. Cal. Commuters Forum
Deborah Chankin	Gateway Cities COG
Deborah Diep	CDR / CSU Fullerton
Eileen Schoetzow	LAWA
Tony Van Haagen	Caltrans–District 7
Dana Gabbard	So. Ca. Transit Advocates
Tracy Sato	City of Anaheim
Michael Litschi	OCTA
Greg Nord	OCTA
Darrel Bier	Caltrans – District 7
John Stesney	LACMTA
Lori Huddleston	LACMTA
Carla Walecka	Transportation Corridor Agencies

**Via Conference Call:**

Michelle Merino	IVAG
Brian Kuhn	City of Palmdale
Yvonne Sells	SCAQMD
Dr. Paul Fagan	Caltrans-District 8

**Via Video Conference:**

Catherine McMillan	CVAG
Shirley Medina	RCTC

**SCAG Staff:**

Naresh Amatya	Hasan Ikharta
Michael Armstrong	Pablo Gutierrez
Phillip Law	Richard Marcus
Bob Huddy	Jonathan Nadler
Andre Darmanin	David Rubinow
Peter Brandenburg	Pria Hidisyan
Shawn Kuk	Annie Nam
Ryan Kuo	
Chris Williges	System Metrics (consultant)
Bill McCullough	System Metrics (consultant)

## **1.0 CALL TO ORDER AND INTRODUCTIONS**

Miles Mitchell, Vice-Chair, called the meeting to order at 10:11 am. Introductions were made.

## **2.0 PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD**

There were no public comments.

## **3.0 CONSENT CALENDAR**

### **3.1 Approval Items**

#### **3.1.1 Approve Minutes of May 17, 2007**

Members reviewed minutes and recommended the following changes:

- Yvonne Sells, SCAQMD requested the following revision:
  - Page 4, paragraph 1, of the minutes as follows: “Mr. Nadler stated that the technical work for conformity requires that all of the ~~non-~~  
~~conformity~~ non-attainment areas be addressed.”

*Motion was moved and unanimously approved.*

#### **3.1.2 Approve Minutes of May 31, 2007**

*Motion was moved and unanimously approved.*

## **4.0 INFORMATION ITEMS**

### **4.1 Update on AQMP Measures**

Jonathan Nadler, SCAG, provided members with a brief overview of where we are regarding the goods movement control measures and the South Coast Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) in general.

The South Coast AQMD governing board took action on the South Coast AQMP on June 1<sup>st</sup>. At this meeting, SCAG had requested that the AQMD Governing Board delay action on the goods movement control measures. The AQMD Board adopted the plan with resolution language stating that until such measures are adopted the primary control strategy relies on the proposed ARB measures, which includes the AQMD's overlay of 63 tons per day of NO<sub>x</sub>. SCAG has initiated further consultation with our transportation partners and other stakeholders regarding the measures, which are ongoing. Some TAC members have been in those meetings. We have concluded that there is a need to continue consultation on the goods movement control measures, and staff will communicate this to AQMD prior to their July 13<sup>th</sup> public hearing.

As the dialogue with stakeholders proceeds regarding the goods movement control measures and any other control measures, SCAG staff will keep the TAC apprised of the discussions.

The ARB is considering the State Strategy at a public hearing this Friday. Interestingly, they will not be taking action on the South Coast AQMP at that time. Instead, they have decided to postpone consideration of the South Coast AQMP until October. There is obviously some concern with this decision considering that there is a disagreement among the agencies about how much reductions are needed to demonstrate attainment of the PM<sub>2.5</sub> standard. This meeting will be held at the Los Angeles Airport Marriott Hotel and will begin at 8:30am.

Another item to note regarding the October hearing date for the South Coast AQMP is that the EPA typically takes about three months to approve the conformity emissions budgets once the SIP is submitted to the EPA. Thus, if there are no major issues with the budgets and there is no alternative approval process, we are looking at getting approved emissions budgets within the January 2008 timeframe. This is something to consider when discussing the RTP schedule.

Dana Gabbard, So. Ca. Transit Advocates, questioned whether the \$40 billion in the five-year plan is still in the plan. Mr. Nadler stated that what we had put on the table is what had been previously discussed. We have asked for a delay in terms of those particular items, and are in consultation with our transportation partners. We don't have anything to report now, but we are also looking at alternative measures that we can put on the table considering that transportation sources make up the bulk of the emissions that need to be reduced at this point. Mr. Gabbard questioned whether they gone away completely. The answer is no, there is still consideration of how we might move forward with alternative types of transportation systems, truck-only lanes, or some other form of reducing emission, but we have not committed to anything.

Deborah Chankin, Gateway Cities COG, asked for elaboration on the procedural steps as to how the outcome of the consultation will be adopted by SCAG and submitted to the AQMD. Mr. Nadler stated that when the SCAQMD took action on June 1<sup>st</sup> they delayed action on these measures and will put forth two options for the July 13<sup>th</sup> Board hearing - with or without the measures included. SCAG will be transmitting to them that we are not ready to move forward with these measures as such. Considering that the ARB is delaying action on the South Coast AQMP until October, there is still time for us to discuss among the stakeholders. Any measures would come through our policy committees and back to the Regional Council to make a final decision of what to do prior to the October hearing.

Ms. Chankin asked if it is correct to assume that from the AQMD standpoint, they adopted the AQMP without the two measures and submitted it to ARB for its consideration. Mr. Nadler answered that the AQMP as adopted did not include the two measures but did include the reductions that are in dispute - the 63 tons assigned to ARB, and that is basically why ARB has delayed their consideration until October. There is a genuine interest among the agencies to work through the issues.

Ms. Chakin asked if the plan incomplete or inconclusive from the AQMD side? Mr. Nadler stated that the AQMD's attainment demonstration includes 63 tons per day of NO<sub>x</sub> reductions by 2014 that are assumed to be necessary to show attainment. Ultimately it is the ARB's responsibility to approve the SIP and forward it to the EPA.

The ARB has been making a point that even though the attainment modeling does not show that you hit the standard by 2014 absent these 63 tons, you can use a weight of evidence demonstration which highlights other relevant factors. These are the discussions that still need to occur.

Ms. Deborah Diep, CDR / CSU Fullerton, asked if in fact there's action in October and the conformity budgets don't get approved until January, what does this do to your adoption of the RTP update? Hasan Ikharta, SCAG, answered that we are still moving forward in releasing a draft RTP in October with the draft budgets. We are going to assume that these draft budgets will be approved. The plan is to adopt a final RTP with the final budgets sometime in January or February.

#### 4.2 2003 Base Year & 2035 Baseline

*Due to time constraints, this item was postponed until the next P&P TAC meeting.*

#### 4.3 Aviation/Ground Access Report

Mike Armstrong, SCAG, presented members with a report on the Aviation/Ground Access Report.

Historically, the regional aviation element has been a very important component of the RTP. Southern Californians rely strongly on transportation to connect ourselves to the world. As we are updating the RTP we are also updating the aviation element of the 2008 RTP. The aviation element is really centered on the forecast of aviation demand and how we allocate the aviation demand of the individual airports in the system, and you don't expect a lot of surprises or big changes. The main reason for this is that the universe of possibilities in the regional aviation system has shrunk dramatically with the loss of El Toro and the regional consensus settled on the LAX Master Plan, as well as basic regional consensus that we need to respect our physical and legally enforceable capacity constraints on urban airports and decentralize to the extent possible to the suburban airports where there is available capacity through enhanced ground access.

There were a few issues that carried over from our last plan, such as that March Inland Port didn't like our eight million air passenger forecast map, mainly because we had March on constraint and had high-speed transport link to March. We did review the capacity forecast for March that is consistent with their joint use agreement. We increased the capacity of Ontario from 30 to 31 and performed a more detailed analysis of the capacity of the two-runway system. We also reduced Bob Hope a bit because they objected to the remote parking positions that we assumed as well as our capacity analysis. We also used conservative assumptions in the forecast mainly tied to assumptions about the doubling of real fuel costs and how it would translate into airfares and into a dampening of demand. This was built into the forecasting. Even though we are going out to 2035 instead of 2030, the forecasts remain pretty much the same. We are looking at a constrained, unconstrained, and a preferred alternative. The preferred was the transport and the numbers are pretty similar for the unconstrained, which assumes no capacity constraints whatsoever. The revised forecasts have been taken to the Aviation Technical Advisory Committee (ATAC) and the ATF, and we are



going to be taking the forecast to the ATF again next month. Hopefully they will approve to take it onto the TCC.

Another interesting new thing that we are doing is including the demand from commuter airports. We are including Oxnard Airport and Palomar Airport in San Diego; for analytical purposes, we are including demand from San Diego County assuming a limbered fuel constraint of 23 MAP with no new commercial being built in San Diego. San Diego is a problem because the number of passengers and the amount of cargo coming up to our ports will most likely increase.

As we did for the 2004 RTP we are developing an airport ground access element using the same methodology and the same consultant. The consultant has completed the basic analysis and is now in the process of refining the projects that were in the last RTP in consultation with the various airports. LAX has not determined what projects they will implement. There is a controversy on the green light project. Dr. McKenzie with Citigroup Technologies will have this work done in early July and will be bringing his results to you at next month's meeting.

We have preliminary results from the updating of the current conditions through updated ground counts. The consultant does his own ground counts throughout every airport and throughout the region, and also updates the passenger surveys. This provides for very recent information to use in the ground access analysis. Some of the things that the new analysis and the updated ground counts indicate are that urban congestion is spilling out to the suburbs. Compared to a few years ago, there is significant congestion on Friday afternoons and Sundays from urban return traffic from places like Las Vegas and San Diego, which is impacting our freeways at the beginning and end of the weekend. We find things like local travelers in OC are increasingly using local arterials to avoid congestion on the I-405. We are finding that airport access to ONT, LAX, and John Wayne are heavily influenced by area congestion. A greater percentage of passengers are accessing these airports using arterials, which has an impact on our ground access analysis. We are also finding that passengers departing for LAX and ONT are departing significantly earlier in the day to make their flights. This is a product of increasing highway congestion and the fact that if you don't get to the airport on time, you can get bumped from your flight, and because of very high load factors, you may not be able to find another flight that day. We have two contradictory trends: (1) increasing highway congestion, and (2) more unpredictability in being able to access airports, particularly airports at a distance, along with increased requirements to be at the airport on time. This is why we need predictable access to airports, which is becoming harder and harder to do, particularly without some high-speed rail. If this does not happen, then we will need to come up with another alternative of getting passengers to airports in a predictable and reliable fashion.

Here are some other findings when compared to two years ago. International airport passengers described their arrival at LAX as being more and more confusing, particularly with the overlapping ground access options such as the mini private vans and shuttles at LAX. Additionally, there is a lack of clear signage and signage only being in English, particularly with passengers traveling for the first time to Southern California. Also, people are having increased difficulty in finding rental car facilities at



LAX. There has also been a significant interest on the part of passengers for potential service at Palmdale. Palmdale has better terminal facilities, a wider portfolio of available flights, and transportation from the LA urban core.

Interest was also expressed of potential service at March, particularly if there was reasonably priced service to Mexico. Lastly, passengers are increasingly asking for more reliable easy-to-use access modes such as FlyAway for major activity centers. We are in the process of conducting a major flyaway study and seeing how we can link flyaways with our HOV system. The gaps are being filled in to the HOV system and linking flyaways with light and heavy rail facilities, particularly Metrolink, to airports, and to other airports besides LAX, specifically ONT.

Carla Walecka, Transportation Corridor Agencies, asked how ground access projects work. Does SCAG do modeling and recommend a package of ground access projects to each county transportation commission, or do you start with the existing ground access projects that each county has in its transportation plan? Mr. Armstrong answered that we start fresh and divide them into the ones that have been programmed into the RTP and ones that haven't. The thinking is that airports think about what projects they need to concentrate on in submitting projects to us, but we really need a process to get the CTC's to agree.

Eileen Schoetzow, LAWA, asked if there is any mention in the plan regarding the proposed Gold Line extension from Montclair to ONT. Mike stated no, but we will make sure that the consultant mentions the possibility. This is a fairly new proposal but it is definitely something that we would want to take a look at.

#### 4.4 RTP Finance

Chris Williges, System Metrics, provided an update on the status of the financial planning for the RTP. In the previous month's meeting, Annie Nam, SCAG, provided a forecast of revenues of about \$212 billion in 2005 dollars. I'm changing that number today to \$237.6. We have changed the year of the dollars that we are looking at from 2005 to 2007 because all of the project costs that we are getting are in current year dollars. If we are looking at revenues in 2005 and comparing them to costs in 2007, it doesn't work so well. The \$237.6 is in 2007 dollars. You should also note that we found one mistake in the calculation earlier, which we corrected. This was an error in the SHOPP revenue calculation. The main reason for doing this is because we wanted to compare the revenues to the cost. We have been looking at the project costs that have come in and we have about \$135 billion in 2007 dollars of project costs. When we have gotten the project costs in from the county commissions, there has been some confusion about looking at year of expenditure dollars versus constant 2007 dollars. This is something that we have been working with the county commissions and we think we have got it cleaned up, but some of these numbers may change a little bit. When you look at the \$135 billion, it sounds great when compared to the \$236 billion, except that it doesn't include all of the costs.

We also need to include highway preservation costs, and transit operating and maintenance costs. We made a very conservative assumption; we assumed that the amount of money that the state would request in the SHOPP reflects the needs that will

actually be funded. It is impossible for all of the highway preservation needs to be fully funded; if they were fully funded, there would be no STIP for the next several years. This assumption says realistically, what would be funded in terms of preservation needs is what would be funded through the SHOPP. If we go to full needs, our full needs will be higher. Second, the transit operating and maintenance costs are difficult to predict. It's a function of the revenue miles of service that you will operate in the various transit agencies, the age of the fleet that you are operating, the kinds of labor contracts that you will have in the future, and other costs as you expand the system. What we did is we looked at historic transit operating and maintenance costs. We pulled data over the last eight years because that is the number of years that we were able to easily get our hands on. What you find is that there is a fairly big variation in how much transit operating and maintenance costs have risen within the last eight years. That is a function of the type of operator that you are looking at. There is a difference in operating rail transit versus bus transit if you have a mature system that is not expanding much versus a system that is adding a lot of service. Obviously the operating and maintenance costs would be greater in that case.

The operating and maintenance costs in the region have increased between one and ten percent annually over the last ten years. This comes to a region-wide average of about four percent. We have used the four percent operator as our increase in transit and operating maintenance costs over current costs for our forecast. What we have done in Metro's case is that they have forecasted for us how revenue miles of service would change as well as transit operating costs. So, we have used Metro's forecast for LA County. You will notice on the graph that there are differences in individual years in the forecast, but it turns out that we are very close in the two forecasts. Therefore, we feel comfortable using Metro's forecast for LA County. You might ask why this is such a big deal. Well, when you add in transit and operating maintenance costs and you add in the SHOPP, you will notice that our previous bar that only went up to \$135 billion now goes up to \$235 billion. This suggests that we are roughly in balance between revenues and costs. We have \$237 billion in revenues and \$235 billion in costs, which sounds pretty good.

However, we are taking projects from County long-range transportation plans that go through 2030, and our RTP goes to 2035. This suggests that although we have revenues through 2035 and costs through 2030, we are roughly in balance right now. This is slightly a better picture than we had in the last RTP, but there are a few other things that I should point out about the forecast. In terms of transit vs. highway costs, highway costs are about \$120 billion and transit costs are about \$115 billion based on the color of money. This means that slightly more of the more flexible funding sources need to go towards highway than towards transit. Due to the color of money, more funding is dedicated towards transit than highways.

In our forecast of project costs, there are several costs we haven't accounted for yet, and we will before the end of this RTP. One of these is debt service, which will be added to the cost. There are projects from the multi-county effort that haven't been added in yet, as well as the rehabilitation costs that Metro has. It sounds like our costs will increase quite a bit, and we are going to be out of balance.

We expect that once we get the costs and revenues finalized, we are going to have to make a few tradeoffs, and here is a first view of the breakdown of the costs. You can see that Baseline costs are \$127 billion and Tier 2 costs are \$17 billion. We have added in another term called Tier 3, which are costs in the plan that have identified local match money. The concept here is that it's a planned project and if it already has local match money, it means that it was probably included in the sales tax measures and that there may be a bit more commitment towards these projects.

We also need to review some of the project costs a little more fully. There are five projects that were submitted by the county commissions that cost more than 3 billion dollars each. As you'll see, just these five projects account for one quarter of the full projects costs, so if we would want to be pretty accurate on our project cost estimate, just getting these projects accurate would improve one quarter of our project cost estimate.

Lori Huddleston, LACMTA, stated that the Metro board approved a different fare policy a few weeks ago and so the financial model will need to be completely re-run and that won't be ready probably until the end of August. But as soon as they have any information, they will e-mail that. Mr. Williges stated that he is glad that she mentioned that because what he has right now for transit and operating costs are from the previous model, and he is aware that the fare revenue policy will change.

Tony Van Haagen, Caltrans–District 7, thought that the 710 tunnel was 3 billion rather than 5.8, and asked if there has been a new estimate on this. Ms. Nam stated that this was based on a submittal by the MTA. The submittals were based on constant versus year of expenditure dollars so that is the difference. Ms. Huddleston stated that it depends on the year that you believe construction will start. The later that construction starts, the higher the costs go because of inflation and escalation. Mr. Williges stated that the feds are requiring that we show the costs and the revenues in nominal dollars, in year of expenditure dollars so that when we finally put the numbers in the RTP and show them to the feds, they will be in nominal dollars and not in constant dollars. It's just that in making the comparison for us, the year in which you build the project does make a difference where there are nominal dollars. It's easier for us to come into balance with constant dollars and move back to nominal dollars.

David Mootchnik, So. Cal. Commuters Forum, asked if the Orange countywide bus service expansion is just capital O&M costs. Mr. Williges answered that it is just capital. This number is a lot bigger than in the previous RTP.

If we have project costs that are unchanged from the 2004 RTP in 2002 dollars and are now looking at those same projects for the 2007 RTP in 2007 dollars, then we will need to increase them by something, or else it will not pass the credibility test when we go to the feds to show the plan. The best number right now is the 80% increase, which is a huge increase. We are led to have an increase that people would believe. If anyone has better project costs estimates, then we are happy to take them.

One of the more interesting things is where you compare the projects with the costs. We got information with start dates and end dates and when you get farther into the future,

it is hard to know exactly when a project is going to start. For the purposes of this graph, we assumed any project in its completion date gets constructed in the one year. This is quite an assumption with large projects, and this is why you'll see in 2030 that the line spikes up. But if you take a five year running average of the costs, which starts taking into account that you might need to shift some projects around when they get constructed, projects are built over several years and you'll notice that we're in balance in terms of when we think we're going to complete projects and when revenues are available. We also looked at the costs and revenues by county. We are out of balance at the county level. Los Angeles County is understandable because their plan goes to 2030 and we've extrapolated the revenues through 2035. For Orange County and Riverside County, we are still looking at this, but we think that we may have double counting going on. We believe that this may just be a function of how the projects lists were requested by us and submitted by the counties, so we just need to scrutinize this a bit more.

Our next steps are to account for other costs, debt service, products in multi-county efforts, Metro rehabilitation costs, and this will increase our estimate of the RTP cost. We also need to update costs that have not been changed since the 2004 RTP. This will increase RTP costs. We need to review projects that were submitted as part of the plan that were really SHOPP projects, as well as projects that were submitted and were not included in the long range transportation plans. As we begin to pull out some of these projects, that's actually going to decrease the RTP costs, so I'm not quite sure where the net will be. But, I think that it means that our costs are going to be higher than they are right now.

Miles Mitchell, LADOT, asked that since the RTP has to be balanced, what happens if after we take these next steps, we end up with costs that exceed revenue. Mr. Williges replied that as part of the RTP effort, we have another effort going on that looks at alternative financing methods. We are hoping that those alternative financing mechanisms will help make up some of that shortfall. Mr. Mitchell asked if you are expecting a substantial shortfall. Mr. Williges stated that it is too early to tell, but we are expecting a shortfall.

Ms. Walecka asked about switching back and forth between 2005 and 2007 dollars. How much of an increase over the 2005 costs is this latest package that you have looked at? Mr. Williges replied that the increase is about 7%.

Mr. Mitchell wanted to clarify that this would not include whatever projects SCAG would be proposing to achieve the 22 tons of emissions reduction. Mr. Williges replied that that is right.

Mr. Mootchnik commented that there's something funny about the \$9.6 billion for the OC bus expansion if it's just capital. At \$400,000 per bus, it represents a purchase of 2 million buses. I don't think that this is correct and I understand that there are other purchases that would need to be made, but most of the expansion is buses. Michael Litschi, OCTA, stated that he does not think the number is correct, and that we can look at the numbers and discuss later.

#### 4.5 Standing Item

##### 4.5.1 Growth Forecast

Frank Wen, SCAG, discussed the process and strategy of the RTP scenario revisions as well as the technical analysis that was followed. Mr. Wen stated that the baseline socioeconomic data set and the model run have been completed. The next step is to develop the 2007 RTP Regional Land Use Strategies for the Growth Forecast and the socioeconomic dataset. From previous workshops, we have found out that many of the core components of land use strategies, such as the TOD, the Centers, and the interactions between the centers and the TOD have been missing from the last RTP. We will now focus on revisiting the core land use strategies and look at the inter-county job housing balance. For example, we will look at the balance between Riverside and Orange Counties. We will look at shifting jobs and job centers between Orange and Riverside, and how we can intensify and add growth along those corridors.

Lingqian Hu presented the analysis that is currently being done on the key components: employment centers, transit-oriented development and job housing ratio. Ms. Hu stated that the employment centers analysis used USC Professor Jan Giuliano's method. The method states that a cluster of contiguous TAZ's has a minimum employment density of 10 jobs per acre, and together contains 10,000 total jobs. Ms. Hu stated went on to provide examples of TAZ's used in the 2003 Base Year. In the future, 2035 Baseline data will be used.

Ms. Hu stated that around TOD areas, there is a high concentration of jobs and also attract more households. When this is compared with all of the TAZ's, we can find that TAZ's have the potential to attract employment and households.

Ms. Hu also stated that the job household ratio for employment centers is pretty imbalanced: only 17 out of 46 centers have a job/household ratio higher than 10, but only 8 have a ratio less than 3. Ms. Hu presented a map illustrating TAZ's with long commute distances.

Glen Bolen, SCAG consultant, discussed how the analysis that SCAG staff has done would be used in creating the land use scenario to achieve better results. He talked about redefining land use assumptions, looking at how to move growth around the centers, and how to make localized adjustments. A TAC member stated that during their research on the several expo stops, three different buildings types were tested along with City of Los Angeles planning staff to be townhouse, small mixed use, and large mixed use, ranging from 29 to 113 units per acre. What we learned from this research is that the buildings that are being built near these transit stations are a lot more intensive than the 35-unit buildings that were built back in 2003. Mr. Bolen provided photo simulation examples.

Mr. Bolen stated that in some cases the amount of infill opportunity was higher than expected. He showed a few maps from the Expo station that have been field verified by City of LA staff walking around on foot. We did detailed GIS partial



base analyses with those performers looking at where it could apply and where a building would be profitable to be built.

The results of the analysis are not out yet but what they are trying to do is help us understand how we can get intrazonal trip capture, meaning that people can make trips without going outside of TAZ's. We are finding that having nearby grocery stores are huge at minimizing trip length. We are trying to use these lessons to help us do an urban design at a regional scale to help us create those opportunities.

A TAC member stated that they have seven volunteer cities going through their general plans, estimating capacity, and comparing their capacity to the 2004 RTP update to find out where we are overestimating or underestimating. We are finding that there is more capacity in nodal areas. This helps us learn lessons overall because we are finding that some of the linear approaches that we had in our scenario aren't as popular as these concentrated nodal areas, which are coming at a higher density than we expected. We've used these to help us develop rules such as adding housing near transit centers and employment centers.

Ms. Diep asked if Mr. Bolen is proposing that these be rolled into the RTP. Mr. Bolen answered that he is talking about a series of rules or another test scenario for the RTP to see if we can increase transit ridership and decrease trip length. I'm showing you some of the opportunities that we have to do this and the key is trying to locate more people in those transit areas and create more balance within those employment centers.

Ms. Chankin commented that she does think that the use that this will be put is critical and it does require some conversation, when we have the leisure to have this conversation. When we went through the last round of workshops, cities were explicitly told that the intent now is to use this growth scenario for both housing and transportation. That was one of the transformative changes that were made this year, and at this point in time, if it's leading to an RTP test scenario, then I think that we need some more conversation about how we've been talking with cities about the growth projections. If it's being used in this way then we need to understand it at a greater detail that just a couple of minutes won't allow. Mr. Gabbard stated that what our friends are trying to say is "Is this a best practice toolbox or are we trying to backdoor turn this into a mandate?" Is this your intention? Mr. Wen answered that he understands your concern. SCAG staff is very mindful about local input and the implications of policy.

Mr. Mitchell requested that an e-mail be prepared to be sent throughout the region summarizing what this effort is. I thought Dana put it well. Is this a best practices toolbox or is it a mandate? Does it not apply until after 2014? Will it or will it not affect TAZ's? We need to get the word out as to what this is all about. At some point we need to get an email. Naresh Amatya, SCAG, stated that as a starter, please know that all of this information is available on the website. All of this information is posted for everyone's review. Mr. Miles suggested that we think about an e-mail.

4.5.2 Highways & Arterials

*There was no report.*

4.5.3 Non-motorized / TDM

*There was no report.*

**5.0 STAFF REPORT**

Mr. Amatya took the opportunity to inform the TAC members that this would be the last meeting for Shawn Kuk, SCAG, who will be moving on to the City of Los Angeles. Mr. Amatya also thanked Mr. Kuk for all of his efforts towards the P&P TAC.

**6.0 ADJOURNMENT**

- 6.1 Mr. Mitchell adjourned the meeting at 12:20 pm. The next meeting of the Plans & Programs Technical Advisory Committee will be held at SCAG's Los Angeles office on July 31, 2007.